



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,370	03/11/2001	Craig Schmidt	020431.0973	2848
53184	7590	07/12/2006	EXAMINER	
i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC. ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD DALLAS, TX 75234			AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/820,370	Applicant(s) SCHMIDT, CRAIG	
	Examiner Olabode Akintola	Art Unit 3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to applicant's remarks received on 06/16/2006.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Specification

The objection to the specification has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Particularly in Claim 1, it is not clear who is providing a reserve price corresponding to a maximum purchase price and minimum sales price. Although in the specification, the buyers and sellers set (provide) these prices respectively, it is not positively recited in the claim as the claim can be broadly interpreted as a third party or computer or either of buyers or sellers generating reserve prices making the claim indefinite.

Also, in the step of generating a matrix, it is not clear because applicant has not positively claimed what data is being used to generate the matrix.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Lupien et al (US 5689652).

With regards to Claims 1 and 13, Lupien teaches a method and system for optimizing prices at which products are sold in an automated marketplace, comprising the steps of: generating a matrix of all possible buyers and sellers; for each buyer, providing a reserve price corresponding to a maximum purchase price; for each seller, providing a reserve price corresponding to a minimum sales price (see Col. 11, lines 55-65; Col. 12, lines 1-14); calculating a utility value for each pairing of buyers and sellers; selecting a unique pairing of buyers and sellers that maximizes total utility; calculating a buyer optimal allocation of the total utility for all buyers and sellers in a stable manner; calculating a seller optimal allocation of the total utility for all buyers and sellers in a stable manner (see Col 6, lines 11-38, col. 9, lines 20-30, Fig. 8 {108}); and for each pair in the unique pairing, selecting a transaction price that allocates the utility between that seller and that buyer (see Col. 4, lines 10-27)

With regards to Claim 2, Lupein teaches the step of providing a reserve price for each buyer comprising the step of: for each buyer, providing a reserve price corresponding to a maximum purchase price, wherein at least one buyer limits the sellers to which the buyer agrees to be matched to a subset less than all possible sellers (see Col. 6, lines 23-29; Col. 9, lines 31-40).

With regards to Claims 4, Lupein teaches the step of providing a reserve price for each seller comprising the step of: for each buyer, providing a reserve price corresponding to a minimum sales price, wherein at least one seller limits the buyers to which the seller agrees to be matched to a subset less than all possible sellers (see Col. 5, lines 65+; Col. 9, lines 31-40).

With regards to Claims 3 and 14, Lupein teaches that each buyer sets a reserve price for each possible seller with whom that buyer agrees to be matched, and wherein the reserve price can be different for each such seller (see Col. 6, lines 23-29).

With regards to Claims 5 and 15, Lupein teaches that each seller sets a reserve price for each possible buyer with whom that seller agrees to be matched, and wherein the reserve price can be different for each such buyer (see Col. 5, lines 65+).

With regards to claims 6 and 16, Lupein teaches the steps wherein the utility value calculated for each pairing of a buyer and a seller is a difference between that buyer's reserve price and that seller's reserve price (see Col. 6, lines 23-29).

With regards to Claims 7-10, Lupien teaches the step of selecting a transaction price comprises the steps of: providing a proportion value between 0 and 1; and selecting a transaction price which is proportional to a difference between the optimized seller utility and the optimized buyer utility equal to the proportion value (see Col. 5, lines 61+; Col. 6, lines 23-29).

With regards to Claim 11, Lupien teaches the step of conducting product transactions at the selected transaction prices (see Col. 4, lines 10-27).

With regards to Claim 12, Lupien teaches that the buyers and sellers provide their respective reserve prices by communicating them to a central marketplace server (see Col. 4, lines 6-9).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant states that Lupien fails to teach actual minimum sales price and maximum purchase price. The Examiner disagrees. Lupien discloses this step in col. 5, lines 65- col. 6, line 1 “*but under no circumstances is willing to sell any quantity at \$70.25*” (this corresponds to seller’s minimum sales price). Similarly, in col. 6, lines 22-24, “*but under no circumstances is willing to buy any quantity at \$24*” (this corresponds to buyer’s maximum purchase price).

Also, applicant states that Lupien is silent with respect to calculating a buyer optimal allocation of the total utility for all buyers and sellers in a stable manner; calculating a seller optimal allocation of the total utility for all buyers and sellers in a stable manner. The Examiner asserts that these steps can be found in col. 6, lines 11-38, col. 9, lines 20-30 and Fig. 8 RN {108}. The Examiner broadly interprets *optimal allocation of the total utility* as mutual satisfaction function as described in the Abstract- “*The matching controller computer matches orders so that each trader is assured that the overall outcome of the process has maximized the mutual satisfaction of all traders*”.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 571-272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OA



VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600